I, Peter K. Trzyna (Reg. No. 32, 601), hereby certify that his paper or fee is being sent via Federal Express to the Examiner on the date industrial below and is addressed to the Commissioner of Paterils and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on the date set forth below:



PATENT

Paper No. 3

File: AIS-P1-99

Date:_

August 30, 2001

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor

Daniel L. Marks

Serial No.

09/399,578

Filed

September 20, 1999

For

GROUP COMMUNICATIONS MULTIPLEXING SYSTEM

Group Art Unit

2765

Examiner

RECEIVED

Honorable Commissioner of Patents

JAN 2 5 2002

RECEIVED

and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

DIRECTOR OFFICE TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

SEP 1 0 2001

PETITION TO MAKE SPECIAL FOR NEW APPLICATION UNDER MPEP §708.02 VII

Technology Center 2100

SIR:

Petition Applicant hereby petitions to make this new application, which
has not received any examination by the Examiner, special.

2. <u>Claims</u> All the claims in this case are believed to be directed to a single invention continuation in a patent application that claims priority from U.S. Patent No. 5,956,491. If the Patent and Trademark Office determines that all the claims presented are not directed to a single invention, Applicant will make an election without traverse as prerequisite to the grant of special status.

3. Search

The patent application is a continuation of application Serial

11/21/2001 TDADE1 00000004 500235 09399578 No. 08/617,658, filed April 1, 130.00 CH

No. 08/617,658, filed April 1, 1996, and issuing on September 21, 1999, as U.S. Patent No.

5,956,491. In the parent patent application, the Examiner conducted a search in classes 395 and

200.8. The results of the search, and other information that may be material or of interest, were

made of record in the prior application.

5.

4. Copy of References A copy of each reference or other document

uncovered in the prior applications is already of record in those cases, which the Examiner is

requested to consider again. A duplicate is provided herewith.

Detailed Discussion of the References The pending claims are similar

to those allowed in the parent case. The Examiner made no comments concerning the reasons

for allowance of the patent and cited no prior art in a rejection except that which is enclosed. The

patents cited in the Office Action in the parent case do not disclose an Internet-type structure, as

required in the independent claims. As pointed out in the Amendment and Response in the parent

case, "BLY (Patent No. 5,008,853) instead teaches a local area network structure, although RYU

(Patent No. 5,528,671) teaches what seems to be a relay type of structure." The contention that

neither teaches the above-mentioned claimed features of the present invention on an Internet-type

of structure was sufficient to overcome the rejection, resulting in issuance of the parent patent.

Accordingly, the claimed invention is believed to be patentable over the known prior art.

6. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees

associated with the above-identified patent application or credit any overcharges to Deposit

Account No. 50-0235. Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given

below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 30, 2001

Peter K. Trzy

(Reg. No. 32,601)

P.O. Box 7131 Chicago, IL 60680-7131

(312) 240-0824